

**Remarks**

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that Claims 21-23, 25 and 26 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By way of the present amendment, Applicants have canceled Claims 20 and 21; and amended Claims 15, 17 and 22-24. Eleven (11) claims remain pending in the application: Claims 15-19 and 22-27 of which Claim 15 is independent. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims, in view of the amendments above and comments below.

***Specification and Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter where the phrase “a multi-layer surface” as recited in line 4 of Claim 15 is not described in the specification. The Examiner also rejected Claims 15-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has indicated that the limitation “a multi-layer surface” as recited in line 4 of Claim 15 renders the claim vague and indefinite. Without necessarily agreeing with the objection and rejection, applicants have amended Claims 15, 17 and 23 to remove the term “multi-layer”. Thus this objection and rejection should be removed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

The Examiner rejected Claims 15, 19, 20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Bates et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,635,958.

As now amended, Independent Claim 15 contains, *inter alia*, the allowable subject matter of Claim 21, which claim has been canceled.

In view of the foregoing, the Bates et al. reference does not anticipate independent Claim 15. Furthermore, since Claims 19 and 24 are dependent claims that depend from independent Claim 15, it is also clear that the Bates et al. reference does not, and cannot,

anticipate dependent Claims 19 and 24. Claim 20 has been canceled. Thus the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Bates et al. should be overcome.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner rejected Claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Moore (U.S. Patent No. 6,889,087) in view of Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,511,865). The Examiner further rejected Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Lin, and further in view of Kohno et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,358,762).

As indicated above, independent Claim 15 has been amended to include, *inter alia*, the allowable subject matter of Claim 21, which claim has been canceled.

In view of the foregoing, the obviousness rejection should be overcome with respect to independent Claim 15.

Claims 16-19 and 27 are dependent upon independent Claim 15 directly or indirectly and should be allowable for the same reasons that Claim 15 is allowable.

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 15-19 and 22-27 should be in condition for allowance. An indication of allowability with respect to these claims is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Victoria A. Poissant, should any issues remain after consideration and entry of this response, in order to permit early resolution of such issues.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 06, 2006

/victoria aguilera poissant/

Victoria A. Poissant  
Reg. No. 56,871

Address all correspondence to:  
Bryant R. Gold, Reg. No. 29,715  
Advanced Bionics Corporation  
25129 Rye Canyon Rd.  
Valencia, CA 91355  
(661) 362-1771 or (760) 788-8138  
Fax: (661) 362-1507

Address all telephone inquiries to:  
Victoria A. Poissant, Reg. No. 56,871  
(661) 362-1923